

**FILED**

DEC 10 2009

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332)  
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)  
Chief, Criminal Division

ROBERT N. MICHAELS (PABN 200918)  
Special Assistant United States Attorney

Defense Language Institute -- Criminal Law  
1336 Plummer Street, Building 275  
Monterey, CA 93944  
Telephone: (831) 242-4537  
FAX: (831) 242-5198

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SALINAS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	Criminal No.: CR-09-01073 MAG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	STIPULATION AND ORDER EXCLUDING
	)	TIME
vs.	)	
	)	
CHRISTOPHER ADAM PERRO,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

On December 7, 2009, the parties in this case appeared before the Court. The parties jointly requested that the case be continued from December 7, 2009, until December 28, 2009 at 11:00 a.m. for a status conference. In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from December 7, 2009 to December 28, 2009. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate for potential disposition.

/

/

/

/

STIPULATION AND ORDER EXCLUDING TIME |  
CASE NO: CR-09-01073 MAG

1 SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO  
United States Attorney

2  
3 DATED:

/S/  
ROBERT N. MICHAELS  
Special Assistant United States Attorney

4  
5  
6  
7 DATED:

/S/  
NICK HUMY  
Counsel for CHRISTOPHER ADAM PERRO

8  
9  
10 ORDER

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded  
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from December 7, 2009 to December 28, 2009. The Court finds,  
13 based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested  
14 continuance and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The  
15 failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary  
16 for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a  
17 miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made  
18 under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 DATED: 12/10/09

  
HOWARD R. LLOYD  
United States Magistrate Judge